REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 7-30, as amended, remain herein. Claims 3-6 have been cancelled. New claims 9-30 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification (see, e.g., Figure 2; page 5, lines 11-16 of the specification for claims 1-2; and original claims).

1. The disclosure was objected to for reciting "infection" instead of "injection." The specification has been amended to moot this objection.

2. The disclosure was objected to for reciting amounts δ_1 and δ_2 without identifying what the amounts are. δ_1 and δ_2 are defined in the equations (1) at page 8, line 7 of the specification. δ_1 and δ_2 are used to calculate the equivalent refractive index of a layer when the layer is a laminate of a film having a high refractive index and a film having a low refractive index. δ_1 and δ_2 may not be identified exactly as they vary with the thickness and refractive index of the films constituting the laminate. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

3. Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Utsugi U.S. Patent 5,837,391. The Office Action states that Utsugi '391 discloses a device which meets the limitations of applicants' claims.

Each of applicants' claims 1 and 2 recites an organic electroluminescent device including a transparent electrode, a counter electrode arranged opposite to the transparent electrode, one or more intermediate conductive layers and one or more organic emitting layers arranged between

the transparent electrode and the counter electrode, wherein the organic emitting layer includes a hole injection layer, an organic luminescent medium and an electron injection layer. There is no disclosure in Utsugi '391 of an organic emitting layer including a hole injection layer, an organic luminescent medium and an electron injection layer. Thus, Utsugi '391 does not disclose all elements of applicants' claims 1 and 2, and therefore is not a proper basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). See also claims 7 and 8. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

4. Claims 1, 3 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanaka et al. U.S. Patent 6,107,734 in view of May U.S. Patent 6,211,613. The Office Action states that Tanaka '734 fails to disclose that the difference between the refractive index of the intermediate conductive layer and that of the organic emitting layer is less than 0.2 but that May '613 teaches the refractive indices of the transparent electrode and the organic luminescent layer are similar to eliminate reflection between the interfaces. Claims 3 and 5-6 were cancelled but correspond to new claims 11 and 23-24, respectively.

Each of applicants' claims 1, 11 and 23-24 recites an organic electroluminescent device including a transparent electrode, a counter electrode arranged opposite to the transparent electrode, one or more intermediate conductive layers and one or more organic emitting layers arranged between the transparent electrode and the counter electrode, wherein the difference between n_a and n_b is 0.2 or less when n_a is the refractive index of an intermediate conductive layer and n_b is the refractive index of an organic emitting layer. Tanaka '734 does not teach or suggest an organic electroluminescent device wherein the difference between n_a and n_b is 0.2 or

less when n_a is the refractive index of an intermediate conductive layer and n_b is the refractive index of an organic emitting layer.

May '613 does not disclose what is missing from Tanaka '734. May '613 does not teach or suggest that the difference between the refractive index n_a of an intermediate conductive layer and the refractive index n_b of an organic emitting layer is 0.2 or less. This element is key to achieve improved viewing-angle properties. There is no reference in May '613 to the use of an intermediate conductive layer, arranged between a transparent electrode and a counter electrode. In addition, May '613 is not concerned with improving viewing-angle properties but with improving contrast by using a substrate, a light emissive layer, and a first transparent electrode with similar refractive indices. There is no motivation to combine Tanaka '734 and May '613 as the nature of the problem to be solved is different in May '613 and in the present application. See In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 1998); MPEP 2143.01.

Thus, none of Tanaka, May, or anything else in this record discloses or suggests any of applicants' claims. In addition, there is no disclosure or suggestion in any of Tanaka, May, or anything else in this record that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or render obvious applicants' claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

5. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanaka '734 in view of May '613 and Pei et al. U.S. Patent 6,593,687. Claim 4 was cancelled but corresponds to new claim 17.

Applicants' claim 17 recites an organic electroluminescent device including a transparent electrode, a counter electrode arranged opposite to the transparent electrode, one or more

intermediate conductive layers and one or more organic emitting layers arranged between the transparent electrode and the counter electrode, wherein the difference between n_a and n_b is 0.2 or less when n_a is the refractive index of an intermediate conductive layer and n_b is the refractive index of an organic emitting layer.

As discussed above, none of Tanaka, May, or any combination thereof discloses or suggests an intermediate conductive layer, wherein the difference between the refractive index n_a of the intermediate conductive layer and the refractive index n_b of the organic emitting layer is 0.2 or less. Pei '687 does not disclose what is missing from Tanaka or May. There is no reference in Pei to an intermediate conductive layer, wherein the difference between the refractive index n_a of the intermediate conductive layer and the refractive index n_b of the organic emitting layer is 0.2 or less.

Thus, none of Tanaka, May, Pei, or anything else in this record discloses or suggests any of applicants' claims. In addition, there is no disclosure or suggestion in any of Tanaka, May, Pei, or anything else in this record that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or render obvious applicants' claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

All claims 1-2 and 7-30 are now believed to be fully in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the present amendment to Deposit Account 19-4293. Should the Examiner believe that further changes would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/24/07

Roger W. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 25,177

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1795
Telephone: 202 429-3000
Facsimile: 202 429-3902